

MDOT RESPONSE TO DLS ANALYSIS

Operating Budget Issues

1. WMATA's New Paratransit Provider (Page 12)

DLS recommends that MDOT and WMATA brief the committee on the current status of service delivery of the MetroAccess program. Given the rising costs of paratransit for the Maryland Transit Administration, WMATA and MDOT should also address the current and projected costs of MetroAccess and the impact this may have on the Maryland subsidy for WMATA.

MDOT Response:

The transition of the MetroAccess contract from LogistiCare to MV Transportation on January 15, 2006 resulted in numerous late and excessively late trips for paratransit riders. As the DLS analysis indicates, many of the early problems resulted from inaccurate or incomplete data from the previous provider, which was then exacerbated by a failure to have all the phone lines operational on the day the service was transferred to MV Transportation.

By February 8, MV Transportation completed the process of correcting the backlog of incorrect data and started making such corrections on a same-day basis. Additionally, on February 8, the service started making automated calls to all patrons to inform them that their ride was near, alleviating the need for riders to wait outside for extended periods.

As discussed earlier, increases in the MetroAccess budget disproportionately impact Maryland's subsidy to WMATA. The program has been experiencing increases of 12-14% over the past few years. On January 15, 2006, WMATA started a four-year, \$210 million contract with MV Transportation to provide paratransit service. If the contracted service is not adequate to meet the future demand, WMATA staff may come back to the WMATA Board to request an increase in the contract.

MDOT RESPONSE TO DLS ANALYSIS

Capital Budget Issues

1. Prospect of Additional Federal Funds (Page 15)

DLS recommends that MDOT discuss:

- **would the requirement for dedicated funding for WMTAA in H.R. 3496 [the Davis Bill] require a change in the TTF and/or current funding mechanisms for WMATA?;**
- **would the State be required to match the federal funds and if so what impact would this have on the cap[ital plan of the State; and**
- **are there any other financial or operational requirements in H.R. 3496 that could impact State funding for WMATA?**

MDOT Response:

The Transportation Trust Fund is the dedicated funding source for WMATA. To comply with the requirements of H.R. 3496 as presently drafted, Maryland may be required to specifically earmark a portion of the TTF to WMATA.

To receive the federal funding under H.R. 3496, each funding jurisdiction, including Maryland, would be required to cumulatively match the federal funds. It is unclear whether the match would be in equal shares from Maryland, the District and Virginia, or if the allocation from each jurisdiction would be based on existing formulas. Furthermore, as highlighted in the DLS analysis, it is unclear how funding from each jurisdiction would be impacted if the federal government fails to fully appropriate the \$150 million authorized each year under the bill.

Minor financial or operational requirements in H.R. 3496 would result from the addition of the new Office of Inspector General at WMATA.

MDOT RESPONSE TO DLS ANALYSIS

Operating Budget Recommended Actions

1. Adopt the following narrative (Page 16)

Performance Measures. In order to continue to assess the performance of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA), the committees request the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) work with WMATA in order to include in the Governor's fiscal 2008 budget allowance the following data:

- farebox recovery rates for Metrobus, Metrorail, Metroaccess, and for WMATA as a whole;
- total ridership on Metrobus, Metrorail, and Metroaccess in Maryland and throughout the WMATA system;
- operating expenses per vehicle mile;
- operating expenses per passenger trip;
- passenger trip per vehicle mile;
- benchmarks for each of the above data; and
- comparisons to the performance of peer systems.

Actual data shall be reported for fiscal 2005 and 2006, and projections shall be provided for fiscal 2007 and 2008.

MDOT Response: MDOT concurs with the recommendation, but respectfully requests it be clarified. Rather than have MDOT create benchmarks for submittal to DLS, it would be more beneficial for WMATA to adopt measures and benchmarks. The MDOT cannot direct WMATA to institute benchmarks. WMATA staff had indicated in the past that it was developing a strategic plan with performance measures and benchmarks, but no such plan has been presented to the board. MDOT could work with WMATA to develop benchmarks for performance measures, and to identify peer transit properties for comparative purposes. The newly appointed Interim General Manager, will be focused on developing appropriate performance measures.

MDOT RESPONSE TO DLS ANALYSIS

Paygo Capital Budget Recommended Actions

- 1. Concur with Governor's Allowance (Page 16)**

MDOT Response: MDOT concurs with the DLS recommendation.